

### **Remarks**

This Response is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed March 26, 2007. Claims 1-78 were pending in the application. Claims 1-18, 21-26, 54-72, 74, 75, and 78 stand rejected. Claims 39-53, 76, and 77 have been allowed. Claims 19, 20, 58, and 73 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form. In this Response, claims 1-3, 18, 19, 57, 58, 71, 73, and 78 are canceled without prejudice. Applicant expressly reserves the right to continue prosecution of these canceled claims in a continuing application. New claims 79 and 80 are added. Furthermore, claims 22 and 55 are amended to replace the trademark Isopars™ with the generic term isoparaffinic fluids. Claims 63 and 68 were amended to clarify the claims. Claims 4, 14, 20, 21, 54, 59, 64, 65, 66, 69, and 75 have also been amended and are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Claims 4-17, 20-56, 59-70, 72, 74-77, 79 and 80 are now pending in the application, of which claims 27-38 have previously been withdrawn from examination. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

### **Objection**

The Office has objected to claims 19, 20, 58, and 73 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections for at least the following reasons.

The limitations of claims 18 and 19 have been added into independent claims 4 and 14. Claims 18 and 19 have also been canceled. Claim 20 has been amended to depend from claim 4 instead of from canceled claim 19. Prior to this amendment, claim 19 depended from claim 18, which in turn depended upon independent claim 4. Applicant believes that these amendments place independent claim 4 and claims 5-13 and 20 that depend from independent claim 4 in condition for allowance. Applicant also believes that these amendments place independent claim 14 and claims 15-17 that depend from independent claim 14 in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4-18 and objection to claim 20 and allow claims 4-18 and 20.

The limitation of claim 58 has been added into independent claim 54. Claims 57 and 58 have been canceled. Applicant believes that this places independent claim 54 and claims 55 and 56 that depend from independent claim 54 in a condition for allowance. The limitation of claim 55, which was previously intervening between claims 54 and 57, has not been

added into independent claim 54 because the Office's reasoning seems to indicate that this limitation is not necessary for the patentability of claim 54 as amended. Similarly, the limitation of canceled claim 57 has not been added into claim 54 as amended because it is believed to be redundant (i.e., a capacitor electrode film is a subset of an energy storage device electrode film). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 54-56 and allow claims 54-56.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 21-26, 64-68, 75, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kau, European Publication No. 0617441 ("Kau"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled without prejudice.

Independent claim 21 has been amended to recite that the dry mix of recyclable dry binder and dry carbon particles comprise fibrillizable fluoropolymer particles, activated carbon particles, and conductive particles. Applicant believes that claim 21 as amended places claims 21-26 in a condition for allowance for at least the reasons that amended claims 4 and 14 are allowable.

Independent claim 64 has been amended to recite that the one or more recyclable electrode film comprises a plurality of dry processed particles comprising recyclable binder and activated carbon particles. Applicant believes that claim 64 as amended is allowable for at least the reasons that the Office previously indicated that claim 73 included allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 65 has been amended to recite the one or more self-supporting recyclable dry process based electrode film comprises a plurality of dry processed particles comprising recyclable binder and activated carbon particles. Applicant believes that claim 65 as amended as well as claims 66-68 that depend from claim 65 are allowable for at least the reasons that the Office previously indicated that claim 73 included allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 75 has been amended to recite a plurality of recyclable dry processed activated carbon and thermoplastic binder particles formed as an electrode. Applicant believes that claim 75 as amended is allowable for at least the reasons that the Office previously indicated that claim 73 included allowable subject matter.

Claim 78 has been canceled without prejudice.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 21-26, 64-68, and 75, and allow claims 21-26, 64-68, and 75.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-13, 59-63, 69-71, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashida, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,100,747 (“Hayashida”) in view of Goller et al, U.S. Patent No. 4,313,972 (“Goller”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 4 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 18 and 19, which the Office previously indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant thus believes that claims 4-13 are in a condition for allowance.

Independent claim 59, from which claims 60-63 depend, has been amended to recite the electrode film comprises recycled binder particles and activated carbon particles. Applicant believes that independent claim 59 as amended and claims 60-63 that depend from claim 59 are allowable for at least the reasons that the Office previously indicated that claim 73 included allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 69, from which claims 70, 72, and 74 depend, has been amended to include the limitations of canceled claims 71 and 73 that the Office previously indicated was allowable. Applicant thus believes that claims 69, 70, 72, and 74 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4-13, 59-63, 69, 70, 72, and 74, and allow claims 4-13, 59-63, 69, 70, 72, and 74.

Claims 14 and 16 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugeno U.S. Publication No. 2003/0113636 (“Sugeno”) in view of Sloop, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0186110, (“Sloop”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of canceled claims 18 and 19, which the Office has previously indicated that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Although canceled claims 18 and 19 depended from claim 4, Applicant believes that the incorporation into claim 14 similarly places claims 14 and 16 in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as for amended claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that

the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 14 and 16 and allow claims 14 and 16.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugeno and Sloop as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Liu, et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,720,780 ("Liu"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14 and is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 15 and allow claim 15.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugeno and Sloop as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Sano. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 17 depends from claim 14 and is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 17 and allow claim 17.

#### **New Claims**

New claims 79 and 80 are added and are believed to recite devices that are patentable for at least the reasons that the Office previously indicated that claim 73 includes allowable subject matter.

#### **No Fees Believed Due**

The Applicant believes no other fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

**Conclusion**

Claims 4-17, 20-26, 39-56, 59-70, 72, 74-77, 79 and 80 are currently pending in the application. Applicant believes it has fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office action dated March 26, 2007 and believes that claims 4-17, 20-26, 39-56, 59-70, 72, 74-77, 79 and 80 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or believes that any issues could be resolved or prosecution could be expedited via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

June 26, 2007

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas J. Osborne, Jr./

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas J. Osborne, Jr., Reg. No. 39,796  
USPTO Customer No. 59542

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC  
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050  
Denver, Colorado 80264  
Tel: 720-377-0759  
Fax: 720-377-0777